



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, June 25, 2025

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Siegal called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

CAC members present at Roll: Zameel Imaduddin, Sean Kim, Jerry Levine, Austin Milford-Rosales, Sharon Ng, Rachael Ortega, and Kat Siegal (7)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Sara Barz, Najuawanda Daniels, Phoebe Ford (entered during Item 7), and Venecia Margarita (entered during Item 7) (4)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Siegal reported that the Transportation Authority was hosting a virtual Town Hall on June 26, 2025 for the District 4 Community Shuttle Study. As background, she stated that the 2021 District 4 Mobility Study identified a community shuttle as a priority due to high drive-alone rates and low transit usage. She continued to say that staff had developed a business plan for an on-demand shuttle service, detailing service models, operational needs, costs, and funding and was seeking feedback from the community.

Chair Siegal stated that the Brotherhood Way Safety and Circulation Plan aimed to improve safety, circulation, and neighborhood connectivity along Brotherhood Way and Alemany Boulevard. She stated that the study team planned to host three online town halls on July 9, 10, and 17 in English, Spanish, and Cantonese, respectively, and a multilingual in-person town hall on July 15. She said these meetings would review community priorities from earlier engagement, present potential solutions for identified challenges, and collect input on three sketch alternatives. She added that a survey would be released on July 9 to gather further feedback.

Chair Siegal reported that Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), BART, and Muni had partnered this month to test new wayfinding signage at the Powell Muni/BART Station and Hallidie Plaza. She said the pilot was part of MTC's Regional Mapping and Wayfinding Project under the Transit Transformation Plan, which sought to create clearer, more consistent signage across the Bay Area, especially at multi-operator hubs. She stated that MTC sought user feedback to help refine regional signage and wayfinding standards and that the public could provide feedback via a survey on MTC's website.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the May 28, 2025 Meeting - ACTION



4. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Award Contracts to Five Shortlisted Consultant Teams for a Three-Year Period, with an Option to Extend for Two Additional One-Year Periods, for a Combined Amount Not to Exceed \$600,000 for On-Call Strategic Communications, Media and Community Relations Services and Authorize the Executive Director to Negotiate Contract Payment Terms and Non-Material Contracts Terms and Conditions – ACTION**

Shortlisted Teams: Civic Edge Consulting, Contigo Communications, DKS Associates, InterEthnica, Inc., and Kearns & West, Inc.

5. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve Revised Debt Policy and Ratify Investment Policy – ACTION**

6. **State and Federal Legislation Update - INFORMATION**

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Member Ortega moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Milford-Rosales.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Imaduddin, Levine, Kim, Milford-Rosales, Ng, Ortega, and Siegal (7)

Absent: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Ford, and Margarita (4)

End of Consent Agenda

7. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the Fiscal Year 2025/26 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program of Projects, Totaling \$723,264, with Conditions – ACTION**

Mike Pickford, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Kim asked regarding the Short-Term Bike Parking project what percentage of racks were installed on sidewalks versus in bike corrals on the street and how many vehicle parking spaces would be reduced. He said that local businesses were concerned about parking loss.

Mr. Pickford responded that staff would follow up with SFMTA to get specific data, but that the vast majority of racks were installed on sidewalks. He also said that the scope for the application said that bike corrals would be installed in daylight areas at intersections where vehicle parking was no longer allowed.

Member Ng asked what the process was like for requesting bike racks and whether someone could request one anywhere in the city, including in front of a house or business. She said that while someone who might want to request a rack at a particular location, nearby property and business owners may have concerns about installing a bike rack especially if it were to replace car parking. She said that this was a concern in Chinatown.

Mr. Pickford responded that it was possible to request a rack in a residential area, but that SFMTA had focused most installations in commercial corridors. He said that staff would follow up with SFMTA to understand specifically how they evaluate requests



where there may be concerns or opposition to installation of the bike rack.

Member Ortega said that the Emergency Ride Home program did not capture all cases, for example because only people who worked in San Francisco were eligible, not those who lived in San Francisco and worked in a different county.

Henna Trewn, Clean Transportation Program Manager with the San Francisco Environment Department (SFE), responded that many counties have their own emergency ride home programs and that SFE undertook efforts to share information about those programs on its website.

Member Ortega said that she had not seen information about other counties' programs on the SFE website and asked that the information be displayed clearly.

Ms. Trewn agreed that the program had a lot of rules and constraints and that SFE should ensure that information was provided clearly and explicitly wherever possible.

Member Immaduddin asked why Uber and Lyft rides were not eligible for reimbursement from Emergency Ride Home.

Mr. Pickford said that the Transportation Authority Board had voted to exclude ride hail companies. Ms. Lombardo added that Board members had indicated that their intent to support the taxi industry, which was struggling.

Member Ford said that she had tried to use the Emergency Ride Home program and found it very difficult to use citing an example where she was asked to provide evidence that she had been in the office on the day for which she was seeking reimbursement of an emergency ride home. Member Ford said that it sounded nice, but asked, given that it was hard to use, whether it made more sense to discontinue the program and use the funds for something else with a bigger impact.

Vice Chair Daniels asked for lists of locations where Short-Term Bike Parking racks and Treasure Island bike share stations would be installed.

Mr. Pickford stated that SFMTA routinely provided locations of racks installed as part of grant reporting after they were installed and said that lists of previous locations could be provided. Suany Chough, Assistant Deputy Director for Planning, explained that the Treasure Island bike share project would include reaching out to the community for input on the exact locations of bike share stations.

Vice Chair Daniels said that response answered her question about where community input fit in.

Chair Siegal requested usage statistics for the Emergency Ride Home program over time, including whether usage was increasing or decreasing. She said that she liked the idea of the program, but had heard that it was difficult to use and that she was interested in how it had been used.

Ms. Lombardo stated that staff could share CAC feedback with the Air District, as well, to ask if they could provide additional flexibility for a program that has been funded for multiple years and met the cost effectiveness threshold.

Ms. Trewn said that SFE was already pulling statistics together. She noted that they were open to hearing suggestions for improving the Emergency Ride Home program.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked why the Department of the



Environment administered the Emergency Ride Home Program, as similar programs were administered by transit agencies in other counties. He said that he wanted to know how successful it was. He remarked that the program materials stated that the program was advertised in Muni buses, but he had never seen an ad in a bus.

Member Imaduddin moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Ng.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Daniels, Ford, Imaduddin, Levine, Kim, Milford-Rosales, Ng, Ortega, and Siegal (9)

Absent: CAC Members Barz and Margarita (2)

8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the Walter U Lum Place Public Space Study Final Report – ACTION

Member Ng recused herself from the item, given a conflict of interest.

Alex Pan, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Kim confirmed that the recommendation aligned most closely with concept 2 in the packet, which he opined was a good choice. He shared concerns about a design in District 1 when cars parked or broke down, it sometimes caused major problems. He added that concept 2 seemed more practical for small business owners but emphasized the community's perspective was most important.

There was no public comment.

Member Kim moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Milford-Rosales.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Daniels, Ford, Imaduddin, Levine, Kim, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (8)

Absent: CAC Members Barz and Margarita (2)

Recused: CAC Member Ng (1)

9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve a Two-Year Professional Services Contract with SITELAB urban studio in an Amount Not to Exceed \$1,100,000 for Consultant Services for the Geary-Filmore Underpass Community Planning Study – ACTION

Aliza Paz, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ortega expressed concern about risks associated with the federal grant and asked what would happen if the government withdrew the grant.

Mx. Paz replied that the Transportation Authority had just begun work and had not spent much of the money yet and that they were watching the funds carefully and hoped to keep them and complete the project. They added that no alternative fund sources had been identified, but if the team needed to look for other source, they would explore other options and work through them.

Member Ortega asked what would happen if the funds were to fall through after a



contract was awarded.

Rachel Hiatt, Deputy Director for Planning, replied that the agency's contracts included a clause allowing termination under certain circumstances. She said this clause would apply if the funding supporting the contract was not received, resulting in contract termination.

Member Ford asked what the end-of-life timeline was for the existing infrastructure and where funding would come from to implement any plan, emphasizing that this massive project was unlikely to receive another similar federal grant. She also asked what the technical role of a transportation or land use expert was in a planning contract.

Mx. Paz stated they did not have an answer for Member Ford's end-of-life timeline question. They said it was something the Transportation Authority would look into as part of their study and explained that the final report would include an implementation plan that broke down the recommendations into phases or sizable chunks that would be easier to fund versus a single, very expensive project. They added that funding could come from local, state, regional, and/or federal opportunities and that developing a funding strategy was part of their work as they finalized recommendations.

Mx. Paz then explained that technical transportation and land use roles included tasks such as conducting traffic simulation modeling to evaluate how roadway changes impacted congestion and circulation, examining infrastructure factors, including geotechnical conditions and utilities, to determine whether structures like parks or housing could be safely supported on existing overpasses. They highlighted the importance of ensuring that recommendations were feasible and implementable to avoid unsafe or impractical outcomes.

Member Kim asked how the project related to housing and housing needs. He asked if housing could be considered within the covered area and in areas above it. He also inquired about the scope of the project, including whether underpasses would remain and whether the cover would be extended or fully connected.

Mx. Paz stated that the Transportation Authority did not have a recommendation for the Geary underpass and instead aimed to gather community input on what was needed. They explained that multiple design approaches were possible and added that they would ensure that concepts advanced would not preclude a potential future Geary/19th rail project. They emphasized that the land use component of the project would consider housing and other land uses based on community input.

Member Kim agreed that community input was important. He stressed that the area was a critical passage to District 1 from downtown and expressed a desire for the project team to be mindful of potential impacts on transit times such as the 38R.

Mx. Paz stated that the team would conduct broad outreach to gather input, and they would also assess how alternatives impacted travel along the Geary corridor. They said that the analysis would extend beyond a few blocks and consider connections between downtown and the Richmond.

Vice Chair Daniels expressed appreciation for the Transportation Authority's work. She explained that urban renewal in the 1950s caused significant displacement in Black



neighborhoods like the Western Addition and the Fillmore. She said that although it took a long time, she felt excited that San Francisco was finally addressing and reconciling these past wrongs.

Chair Siegal expressed excitement about the project. She asked how the project administrators would identify individuals who were directly displaced or their relatives. She asked whether the project included an explicit goal to provide these people an opportunity to return.

Mx. Paz explained that outreach efforts centered on forming a Community Council composed of representatives from Black, Japanese, and Jewish communities affected by the 1950's urban renewal project that widened Geary into an expressway. They said the council members were selected through an application process and tasked with engaging their communities by recruiting, hosting events, and promoting the initiative. They emphasized the goal of achieving diversity in the council, including representation of various demographics, transportation needs, and travel methods, to ensure broad representation throughout planning and that the Transportation Authority planned broader outreach to include residents and visitors, aiming to encourage widespread participation.

Chair Siegal asked if efforts would also include recruiting individuals who were displaced to other parts of the Bay Area.

Mx. Paz stated they were not directly involved but knew of Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) in the Fillmore and Japantown areas that focused on gathering stories and identifying people. They said the outreach would involve working with those CBOs to encourage participation and that the study's land use component would examine policies addressing anti-displacement and sustainable housing.

There was no public comment.

Vice Chair Daniels moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Levine.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Daniels, Ford, Imaduddin, Levine, Kim, Milford-Rosales, Ng, Ortega, and Siegal (9)

Absent: CAC Members Barz and Margarita (2)

10. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$2,441,000 and Appropriate \$100,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, and Allocate \$2,360,572 in Prop AA Funds, with Conditions, for Six Requests – ACTION

Amelia Walley, Senior Program Analyst, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ortega asked why Public Works (SFPW) requested funding from the Transportation Authority.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, answered that it resulted generally from SFPW, like most city agencies, having insufficient resources. She explained that the Prop L Expenditure Plan, for example, was developed in consultation with sponsor agencies in an effort to help address some of the shortfalls and added that the Transportation Authority put the sales tax measure on the ballot and was responsible



for its administer to various sponsors in keeping with the voter approved measure.

Member Ortega asked how long the repaving process took, citing construction in her neighborhood that seemed to take a long time.

Therese Topacio, Project Manager at SFPW, answered that SFPW typically estimated two years for construction of paving projects and included curb ramps, utility work, and paving. She added that the entire area of the project was not shut down all at once but that locations were closed down as construction was performed at them to minimize disruptions. She noted that the timeline provided included pre-construction activity such as obtaining permits.

Member Ortega expressed surprise at the necessity for SFPW to secure permits to pave and asked what that process entailed.

Anna Laforte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, noted that the open for use date listed in the slideshow was inclusive of all locations in the project contract and said that the full construction phase schedule also accounted for contract advertisement.

Member Milford-Rosales commented that he noticed that protected bike lanes were often littered with trash and asked if the new street sweeper would be able to sweep protected bike lanes.

John Leal, SFPW project manager, stated that SFPW had special, smaller sweepers to clean bike lanes and that they were coordinating with SFMTA to procure two more. He added that San Francisco bike lanes were many different widths which made it challenging to clean them.

Member Kim asked how many sidewalk and curb repair locations were in the backlog and how long it would take to clear the existing backlog of locations. He asked what proportion of the backlog locations was damage due to trees as compared to other damage. He commented that the Transportation Authority should consider prioritizing funding repair locations damaged by trees, especially as the Transportation Authority continued to allocate funding to new tree planting.

Joyce Lee-Yip, SFPW Grant Manager, estimated that there were over 600 locations in the backlog and said she would follow up on the breakdown of locations damaged by trees and locations damaged otherwise. She noted that there was a Tree Maintenance Fund that supported repair at locations damaged by trees, but that funding was limited.

Ms. Laforte added that Proposition E, passed in 2016, set aside funding for tree maintenance and sidewalk repair at locations damaged by trees. She stated that the Tree Maintenance Fund had been responsible for funding that type of damage, while the subject project prioritized curb damage.

There was no public comment.

Vice Chair Daniels moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Ford.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Daniels, Ford, Imaduddin, Levine, Kim, Milford-Rosales, Ng, Ortega, and Siegal (9)



Absent: CAC Members Barz and Margarita (2)

11. Adopt a Motion of Support to Program \$5,672,505 in TNC Tax Funds to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency for Three Application-Based Residential Traffic Calming Projects, with Conditions – ACTION

Rachel Seiberg, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum and Viktoriya Wise, Director of Streets at the SFMTA, followed with a presentation on the status of the Traffic Calming program.

Vice Chair Daniels commented that waiving the petition requirement seemed like a bad idea and had led to the program being fiscally irresponsible. She asked if that requirement would be reinstated given that the pandemic had ended, to ensure there were guardrails in place.

Ms. Wise replied that the SFMTA would consider reinstating the petition requirement during the traffic calming program pause.

Member Ortega stated that fulfillment of the backlog was a great endeavor but asked if the applications were cross-referenced with the High Injury Network, citing the need to prioritize those locations if full funding could not be secured.

Ms. Wise responded that SFMTA was concerned about the High Injury Network and acknowledged that SFMTA was considering community input moving forward, such as letting community members know that traffic calming was happening by placing fliers on doors.

Member Ortega asked if the grade of streets and ground clearance of vehicles were taken into consideration when designing the measures, noting that her vehicle scraped the road at one particular location on a steep hill.

Damon Curtis, SFMTA Traffic Calming Program Manager, explained that the grade of the street was always considered for implementation of all traffic calming devices. He added that all devices were installed by hand crews using hand tools so there was some variation between locations.

Member Ortega mentioned potential concerns for increasingly raised vehicle heights and asked the SFMTA to consider increasingly taller vehicles, which were dangerous to pedestrians.

Member Milford-Rosales noted that installation of traffic calming measures appeared to be a significant portion of the overall cost and stated that the City of Richmond recently passed a measure to allow community-led installations of traffic calming measures. He asked if SFMTA considered that route, especially given the costs and backlog.

Ms. Wise replied that the idea of community-led installations had been brought to her attention in the past and she stated that community-led installations were not being considered by SFMTA due to safety concerns and concerns about proper device installations. She highlighted the importance of authorized and professionally installed traffic calming devices.

Member Kim asked if the SFMTA had identified other lessons learned and specifically asked if the SFMTA employed methodology to prioritize specific locations for traffic calming implementation. He also asked if the SFMTA could use data where there was



a correlation between delays in traffic calming implementation and an increase in traffic accidents to help prioritize selection of locations for implementation.

Ms. Wise replied that the CAC's feedback regarding project prioritization was important to hear. She added that SFMTA was data-driven, which explained why they established the High Injury Network and devoted significant resources to locations susceptible to crashes.

Mr. Curtis added that speeding had a significant impact on the effect of a crash. He continued that SFMTA had significant data on installations and observed a reduction in speeding and excessive speeding after traffic calming devices were installed.

Mr. Kim asked how SFMTA staff measured speed reductions in residential areas. Mr. Curtis stated that SFMTA contracted the data collection out, and speed tubes were used to measure speed and volume of traffic, saying that these studies typically lasted 48 hours.

Vice Chair Daniels asked why the allocation item (next agenda item) amount differed from the programming item amount.

Ms. Lombardo clarified that programming was setting aside funds, while allocation was approving the funds to be spent and that there was already some TNC money set aside or programmed for traffic calming (i.e., the recommended programming amount would add approximately \$5 million to the already-programmed \$1.2 million).

Chair Seigal asked what the plan was for applications submitted through the Fiscal Year (FY) 2024 and FY 2025 program cycles.

Mr. Curtis replied that the SFMTA planned to consider the best way to move FY24 and FY 2025 applications forward during the pause of the traffic calming program and would consider what criteria would be used and how those criteria would fit into the program going forward. He clarified that applications submitted for the FY 2024 and FY 2025 program cycles were on pause, along with the application based traffic calming program itself, while SFMTA addressed the backlog.

Ms. LaForte added that the Transportation Authority had already allocated over \$4 million to the rolling program and stated that SFMTA began evaluating some of those applications.

Chair Seigal expressed her support for proactive measures and encouraged the SFMTA to be creative in using data to prioritize traffic calming measures. She asked what the costs of a proactive program would look like and where SFMTA would seek funding.

Ms. Wise replied that SFMTA had collected significant data, and she noted telemeter data that could potentially be used in the future, subject to evaluation of the quality and applicability of that data for this purpose. She cited the pause to the traffic calming program as an opportunity to consider use of new data sources for program evaluation and prioritization.

Mr. Curtis said that the SFMTA would look to sister cities like Boston, which had a completely proactive traffic calming program, for examples when moving the program forward.



Member Ford asked how SFMTA would prioritize projects in the absence of applications.

Ms. Wise responded that a program pause allowed SFMTA to consider questions like Member Ford's.

Member Ford asked how long the pause to the traffic calming program would be.

Ms. Wise said she was not sure on how long the pause would be, but estimated a minimum of one year, while they focused resources on the backlog of existing traffic calming devices.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that the need for a traffic calming program was an indictment of society and reckless behavior. He expressed his disappointment in spending significant funds to mitigate the poor behavior of a small portion of society.

Member Levine moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Ng.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Daniels, Ford, Imaduddin, Levine, Kim, Milford-Rosales, Ng, Ortega, and Siegal (9)

Absent: CAC Members Barz and Margarita (2)

12. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$6,887,505 in TNC Tax Funds, with Conditions, to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency for Three Projects – ACTION

Rachel Seiberg, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

There was no public comment.

Member Milford-Rosales moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Kim.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ford, Levine, Kim, Milford-Rosales, Ng, Ortega, and Siegal (7)

Nays: CAC Members Daniels and Imaduddin (2)

Absent: CAC Members Barz and Margarita (2)

13. I-280 Southbound Ocean Ave Off-Ramp Improvement Project – INFORMATION

Aliza Paz, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item per staff memorandum.

Member Ortega expressed concern about the project design, underscoring that the map did not clearly indicate the addition of a second vehicle lane. She stated that although she drove through the intersection before, she was not initially aware of this change and urged staff to clearly highlight it. She acknowledged the spatial constraints of the area and described it as a tight and potentially dangerous location, particularly for cyclists. She said the presence of a new signal at the exit could increase the risk of bicycle injuries, as users may not be accustomed to the new configuration. She added that if she were biking through the area, it would feel harrowing and



stressed the importance of coordinating with Caltrans to ensure ample signage along the exit, though she also expressed skepticism about driver compliance. Member Ortega concluded by stating that not extending the protected bike lane further down Ocean Avenue seemed like a missed opportunity.

Mx. Paz stated that the Transportation Authority worked closely with Caltrans on the project, including ramp signage and signal transition timing. They added that these elements, along with public outreach, were important to ensure people understood how to use the new design and also acknowledged feedback from outreach regarding the need for a longer bike connection and said the team was considering how to address it.

Member Milford-Rosales expressed gratitude to the Transportation Authority for revisiting the exit ramp issue. He referenced Member Ortega's comments and highlighted the lack of connection from the Cayuga Avenue Slow Street to the study location, stressing its importance. He expressed significant concern about the double turn lanes in front of the school, citing a serious crash at a similar intersection two years earlier. He stated there was a pattern of pedestrian fatalities at major transit transfer points with heavy traffic, such as 4th and King and West Portal. He urged that the project prioritize the safety of transit users and school pedestrians and called for reconsideration of the double turn lanes near an unprotected bike lane.

Carl Holmes, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, said he heard comments from CAC members regarding the two-lane right turn. He explained that extensive collaboration occurred with SFMTA and that the right turn angle at the intersection was modified to better accommodate avoiding the light rail tracks in the center of Ocean Avenue. He said the two lanes were intended to provide additional storage to reduce driver 'anxiety' caused by signal changes, address risks associated with traffic backing up on to the freeway mainline, and to enhance safety for pedestrians and bicyclists crossing Ocean Avenue. He added that they considered all these factors and were still awaiting more feedback from SFMTA, SFPW, and Caltrans as the design was finalized.

Member Milford-Rosales thanked staff for the additional context. He said he understood the original pledge to cease double turn lanes was made following the 4th and King accident. He explained there were discussions about removing double turn lanes citywide. He expressed curiosity about how the addition of a new double turn lane was justified given that history. He requested information on whether any work was done to establish sight lines at the turn and underscored the danger for drivers in the outside lane whose view may be blocked by drivers on the inside lane. He asked for more information as the process progressed.

Deputy Director Holmes stated that staff applied feedback from the Geneva project previously presented to the CAC and approved by the Board. He explained that adding storage space was essential to reducing the likelihood of rear-end collisions on the highway and that the primary focus remained on pedestrian and bicycle safety. He added that all factors were being considered and there was confidence in the outcome. He acknowledged the concerns raised and offered to provide additional information as needed.

Mx. Paz stated that during the design process, the team worked closely with the SFMTA to consider sight lines. They explained that this collaboration had influenced the proposed angle and overall design.



Member Ford raised several concerns about cyclist safety and traffic design near Ocean Avenue. She described the lack of a stoplight at the Ocean Avenue side as confusing and dangerous, especially for cyclists who cannot anticipate signal timing when approaching from 200 yards away. She stated that maintaining momentum is critical for cyclists, particularly those carrying children. She said a protected bike lane could be installed if one of the two car lanes were removed. She opposed the current design, which forced cyclists into unprotected lanes alongside freeway-bound traffic and recommended metering cars at the ramp to create a single lane feeding into Ocean Avenue, noting the street narrowed to one lane just two blocks later. She also criticized the proposed unprotected left turn onto Howth Street, calling it unsafe and impractical for cyclists due to the need to cross four lanes of traffic from a stop. She stated that Holloway Street, three blocks west, was a better east-west cycling route and suggested extending the bike lane toward Harold or Lee instead. She acknowledged the challenge posed by the lack of signals at those intersections.

Mx. Paz stated there were improvements that could be made to the graphics to better convey the recommended design elements. They clarified that the westbound approach on Ocean Avenue would also have a signal and said the team would revise the slide to show the entire intersection as signalized.

Deputy Director Holmes stated the green light for vehicles exiting I-280 would also stop westbound Ocean Avenue traffic, providing a fully controlled signal for both movements.

Mx. Paz explained that the entire intersection would be signalized, including a signal for the westbound movement, which would be coordinated with the eastern signal to prevent backups on Muni tracks. They clarified that a left turn onto Howth was not a proposed connection and that the conflict markings were meant to guide cyclists continuing onto Ocean. They stated that the recommendation aligned with the District 7 Ocean Avenue Mobility Action Plan, which encouraged directing cyclists off Ocean via Lee and onto Holloway for a calmer westbound route. They underscored the plan's proposal for an off-street bike and pedestrian path from Frida Kahlo to at least the northbound on-ramp, with community support for extending it to Cayuga, Alemany, or San Jose. They explained that the wide sidewalk was designed to accommodate this future path and to avoid tearing out recent construction for future projects. They added that the team was seeking to be strategic with construction funding to align with long-term goals. They deferred the question about 'zippering' to Assistant Deputy Director of Capital Projects, Yana Waldman, or Deputy Director Holmes.

Ms. Waldman said the zippering was an interesting idea but stressed the need to keep storage due to heavy freeway traffic. She explained that merging traffic required a longer ramp that wouldn't fit the space because of physical constraints. She added they could discuss the idea with designers to estimate ramp length if metering or zippering were applied before the Ocean on-ramp.

Member Ford said the ramp needed to be larger because fewer cars entered Ocean per minute.

Ms. Waldman explained that making the whole exit smaller reduced car flow and this caused longer queues extending onto the freeway, which created unsafe conditions. She added that turn pockets were sized to clear expected traffic during a given time.



Mx. Pax explained that the graphic might cause confusion because no second lane was being added to Ocean Avenue. She said that portion of Ocean Avenue already had two lanes, which currently transitioned at the ramp from a single lane to two lanes: one for freeway traffic and one for Ocean Avenue traffic.

There was no public comment.

Other Items

14. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Member Levine said the 47 Van Ness line had been completed some time ago and represented a major project that impacted San Francisco financially, environmentally, and caused significant disruption to businesses along the corridor. He requested comparative performance data now that the line had been in operation for about a year and a half, asking for an SFMTA presentation, a report, and an agenda item for an upcoming meeting. He also made a third request for follow-up statistics and reports on accidents involving bikes, e-bikes, scooters, skateboards, motorcycles, and other battery-powered transportation modes, including data on at-fault responsibility. He emphasized the growing presence of these modes on San Francisco's roads and the urgent need to address their safety impacts.

There was no public comment.

15. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

16. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.